



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/841,415	04/24/2001	Michael P. Straub	Verizon-9	5473	
32127	7590 04/28/2006		EXAMINER		
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.			HONG, H	HONG, HARRY S	
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2614		
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/841,415	STRAUB ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Harry S. Hong	2614			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
	• •	/ IS SET TO EXPIDE 2 MONTH/	e) OD TUIDTY (30) DAVE			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a sign of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe	ebruary 2006.				
	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 19-27</u> is/are pending in the application.					
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 19-27</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 August 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Motic Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		ate latent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/841,415 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1-5, 7, 19, 20, 24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiya et al. (Kajiya; 5,448,626; previously cited and applied) in view of Naylor et al. (Naylor; US 6,625,642 B1; cited and applied for the first time).

٠

Art Unit: 2614

Column 4, line 1 – column 5, line 10 of Kajiya <u>plainly</u> teaches the claimed fax forwarding communications method of above claims. The stored voice telephone number and the fax telephone number are clearly depicted in FIG. 2.

Kajiya is silent with respect to the feature of parallel fax delivery to an E-mail address and a facsimile device/telephone number. However, Naylor plainly teaches such a feature; refer to FIG. 6; column 9, line 50 – column 10, line 13; and column 11, line 46 – column 12, line 4 of Naylor. Naylor also teaches the claimed status indicators of claim 24 (reads on the destination identifiers and the indicators of FIG. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kajiya to forward the fax calls to an email address and a facsimile device/telephone number as taught by Naylor in order to provide the subscribers a more convenient manner of receiving fax documents via multiple media options.

5. Claims 6, 8-13, 21-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiya in view of Naylor as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 19, 20, 24, 26, and 27 above, and further in view of Furman (5,465,295; previously cited and applied).

The claimed peripheral device of claims 6, 8-11, 22, and 23 does read on the TELEPHONE/FAX DISCRIMINATOR of FIG. 6 of Kajiya. However, claims 6, 8-13, 21-23, and 25 differ from Kajiya in view of Naylor in that the method of Kajiya in view of Naylor is not implemented in a public AIN. However, Furman teaches that fax call forwarding methods can be implemented in a public AIN. Therefore, lacking criticality, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement the concept taught by Kajiya in view of Naylor in the public AIN as taught by Furman in order to provide such services to the general public using the

AIN infrastructure. Terminating Attempt Triggers are inherent to AIN signaling.

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Iida teaches another feature of simultaneous fax delivery in a network facsimile apparatus and transmission method; refer to FIGs. 14 and 16; and to column 10, lines 14 18.
- 7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/841,415 Page 5

Art Unit: 2614

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 19, and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry S. Hong Primary Examiner Art Unit 2614

April 27, 2006